

Application Serial No. 10/080,496

Second Proposed Amendment After Final Rejection dated November 24, 2004

Reply to Final Office Action of July 26, 2004

Remarks

Entry of this amendment is requested either to:

- (1) reconsider the final rejection in light of this amendment; or
- (2) place the application in better condition for appeal.

This amendment only (a) cancels claims, and (b) rewrites dependent claims in independent form. Namely, independent claim 1 is former dependent claim 3; independent claim 7 is former dependent claim 10; and independent claim 21 is former dependent claim 23.

This amendment simplifies the issues by rendering moot the rejection based on 35 U.S.C. §102(e), and canceling the withdrawn claims. Applicant hereby reserves the right to overcome this rejection in a subsequent continuing or divisional application.

Claims 1-3, 7-10, 14-15, 21-23, 25-28 and 32-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wicker et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,033,585 in view of Drewery et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,197,165.

Claims 1, 7 and 23 contain a common limitation that is absent from both Wicker et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,033,585 and Drewery et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,197,165. That limitation is: that “the elements [are] electrically conductive bridges electrically interconnecting opposite walls of the slots on the plasma side of the body, thereby interrupting the slots on the plasma side of the body”. By “sides” of the body is meant the opposite sides or faces, for example as shown in Fig. 3A, which shows the side of the body facing the window, and Fig. 3B, which shows the side of the body facing the plasma or chamber. The bridges 34 are on “only one of said sides of the body”, namely, “on the plasma side of the body”, and can be seen only from the plasma side, Fig. 3C, and not from the window side, Fig. 3B.

The significance of this limitation is set forth in the descriptions of Figs. 1A-1C and 2A-2B in the specification, and in the objectives stated in the application, any one of which provides motivation for the recited structure that is absent from either of the cited references. Accordingly, no *prima facie* case of obviousness is presented.

* * *

Application Serial No. 10/080,496

Second Proposed Amendment After Final Rejection dated November 24, 2004

Reply to Final Office Action of July 26, 2004

For the reasons stated above, claims 1-2, 7-9, 14-18, 21-22, 25-26 and 32-36, as amended, are allowable, and an early allowance is respectfully requested.

Should the examiner not allow the claims, entry of the amendment is requested to place the application in condition for appeal.

Respectfully submitted,

WOOD, HERRON & EVANS, L.L.P.

BY 
Joseph R. Jordan, Reg. No. 25,686

2700 Carew Tower
Cincinnati, OH 45202
(513) 241-2324
(513) 241-6234 (Facsimile)